SPECIAL MEETING

1987-88
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, January 21, 1988
2:30 p.m.
Senate Chambers, University Union

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 88-01/FA, Ex., Flr. MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL
PROMISE AWARDS POLICY   (Revises AS 85-13,
amended by AS 86-12)

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the Meritorious
Performance and Professional Promise Awards Policy [Attachment
A].

AS 88-02/Ex.   INCENTIVE FUNDING APPROACHES (AB 2016)

The Academic Senate endorses the position on selected elements
of AB 2016, entitled "Higher Education Talent Development," as
stated in the memorandum from CSUS Senate Chair Barrena to
Bernard Goldstein, CSU Academic Senate representative to the
CPEC Advisory Committee on State Incentive Funding Approaches
for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education
[Attachment B].

D R A F T
California State University, Sacramento

MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARD (MPPP)

Guidelines
~~March 22, 1985~~

I. PREAMBLE

This policy is designed to implement Articles 31.11 through 31.19
of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three (faculty), agreed
to in December, 1984. In any instance of conflict between the
Memorandum of Understanding and this policy, the Memorandum of
Understanding shall govern.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit
Three are eligible to apply or be nominated either for a meritorious
performance incentive award or for a professional promise incentive
award. No individual may receive more than one type of incentive award
in any given year. When a faculty member has received a Meritorious
Performance and Professional Promise Award, any subsequent Award to
that faculty member must be based on considerations other than those on
which an earlier Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Award
was based. This means a faculty member may apply under the same
category in subsequent years if significantly different material is
submitted as evidence for consideration.

Work accomplished by assigned time is not precluded, but the applicant
must declare on the application form the number of assigned time units
involved. The MPPP Committee will take this information into
consideration.

III. AWARD CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA

A. Meritorious Performance Incentive Awards

Meritorious Performance Incentive Awards shall be given in
recognition of outstanding accomplishments and/or performance in
one of the categories ~~and as an incentive for continued excellent
performance primarily in one of the areas~~ listed below. All
persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three
are eligible to apply or be nominated for a Meritorious Performance
Incentive Award.

1. ~~Superior teaching, as demonstrated by excellent classroom
instruction, significant curricular development, development of
effective instructional materials, and/or other indicators.~~

2. ~~Significant professional accomplishments, as demonstrated by juried, refereed, and/or reviewed work, exhibitions, performances, and/or other creative work, continuing research, grant supported activities, consulting activity of a scholarly character, offices held in professional organizations, panels and workshops organized for professional meetings, participation in professional meetings (e.g., delivered papers, addresses, etc.), and/or other indicators.~~

3. ~~Outstanding service to the University community, as demonstrated by exceptional leadership in University governance and campus life at department, school, campus, and/or system levels, and/or other meritorious service consonant with the University's mission.~~

Category 1. Superior ~~Teaching~~ _Contribution to Instruction_ as Measured By One or More of the Following Criteria:

Criterion 1. Outstanding classroom instruction as measured by:
- student evaluations
- peer review
- professional recognition
- results of standardized tests

Criterion 2. Significant curricular development as measured by:
- development of a new program or option within a program
- outreach effort development
- new course development
- development of an interdisciplinary course or program

Criterion 3. Development of effective instructional materials as measured by:
- new classroom materials which have been developed and evaluated for effectiveness
- new types of teaching methodologies which have been developed and evaluated for effectiveness
- development of a model or product which is adopted by other campuses

Criterion 4. Other indicators of superior teaching
The item or accomplishment must show evidence of application and evaluation.

Category 2. Superior Professional Accomplishments as Measured by One or More of the Following Criteria:

Criterion 1. Juried, refereed and/or reviewed work.

Criterion 2. Exhibitions, performances and/or other creative work.

Criterion 3. Continuing research as documented by a periodic progress report.

Criterion 4. Grant-supported and fellowship activity.

Criterion 5. Consulting activity of a scholarly character.

Criterion 6. Elected or major appointed offices held in a professional organization.

Criterion 7. Primary responsibility for organizing a panel and/or workshop for a professional meeting.

Criterion 8. Presentation of a paper or address at or participation on panels at professional meeting.

Criterion 9. Other significant professional accomplishments. The item or accomplishment submitted must show evidence of active participation or primary responsibility.

Category 3. Outstanding Service to the University Community as Measured by One or More of the Following Criteria:

Criterion 1. Exceptional leadership in university governance and campus life at the department level.

Criterion 2. Exceptional leadership in university governance and campus life at the school level.

Criterion 3. Exceptional leadership in university governance and campus life at the university level.

Criterion 4. Exceptional leadership in university governance at the system level.

Criterion 5. Other meritorious service consonant with the university mission.

B. **Professional Promise Incentive Award**

Professional Promise Incentive Awards shall be given to promote activities that enhance the intellectual, cultural, or professional life of the faculty member, or the intellectual, cultural atmosphere of the University. Under this category faculty are encouraged to develop their "good ideas" in one of many possible areas such as instructional innovation, creative work, speculative or exploratory inquiry, or other endeavors which support the cultural enrichment or the professional diversification of the faculty member; the advancement of University programs and goals; or the enhancement of the University mission. All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply or be nominated for a professional promise incentive award.

IV. THE APPLICATION

~~An application for an MPPP award shall not exceed three (3) double-spaced typewritten pages. If necessary, an appendix containing such materials as the applicant or nominee chooses to submit which sustain and/or support a claim to meritorious performance or professional promise incentive awards, may be included.~~

The application shall include the following:

A. completed application form and letters of nomination, if any

B. current curriculum vita

C. application statement which will not exceed three double-spaced typewritten pages. The statement should specify in which award category the application is being made and should relate the applicant's contributions to the award category.

D. appended documents which show how the criteria has been met.

The guidelines for application (A-D above) must be followed or the application will be eliminated from consideration.

V. SELECTION PROCESS

A. **Initiation: The Role of the Individual.** A unit member who wishes to be considered for an MPPP award shall submit an application to the department chair or appropriate administrator not later than ~~(date to be specified later)~~ the published deadline date.

Not later than two (2) calendar weeks prior to the deadline for submission of applications, members of the University community may nominate Unit Three members by writing a supporting letter <u>which indicates the category and accomplishment to be considered</u> to the department chair or appropriate administrator. In such an instance of nomination, the department chair or appropriate administrator shall promptly inform the nominated person and invite him/her to submit prior to the deadline ~~additional materials to be appended to the letter~~ <u>an application as described in Section IV of these guidelines</u>.

insert

B. **The Role of the Department.** On the Monday following the application deadline, the department chair or appropriate administrative equivalent shall/forward all MPPP applications/nominations and supporting materials, if provided, to an appropriate School or administrative unit committee.

C. **Review at the School or other appropriate administrative unit level.** <u>The schools in developing their procedures shall:</u>

1. <u>have the faculty approve through a school established process the school's policies and procedures</u>

2. <u>have a process which is available and distributed to the faculty prior to the beginning of the MPPP process</u>

3. <u>utilize the application form and materials specified in this document</u>

4. <u>establish standards by which to evaluate the applicants</u>

5. <u>provide for deliberation by the total committee for evaluating the applicants</u>

School or other appropriate administrative unit MPPP Committees shall consist of five (5) elected Unit Three members. Wherever possible, school committees shall have no more than one member from any one department. All MPPP Committees must be composed exclusively of unit members who are not themselves applicants/nominees <u>or nominators</u>. Schools or other administrative units shall devise appropriate committee election procedures which shall be approved by a majority vote of unit members, or by a majority vote of the representative governance body of the unit.

Each MPPP committee shall review all applications and nominations in terms of the criteria in III. above and shall ~~select~~ <u>recommend</u> a number of applicants ~~equal to~~ <u>not to exceed</u> the number of awards available to that unit ~~plus a ranked list~~

~~of at least two (2) alternates~~. The remaining meritorious
applicants should be listed in rank order. These
applications/nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean or
other appropriate administrator with the committee's
recommendations, not later than fifteen (15) working days
following the deadline for transmission of the appli-
cations/nominations to the School or appropriate administrative
unit committee.

D. **Review by the Dean or other appropriate administrator.** The
Dean or other appropriate administrator shall review, in terms
of the criteria in III. above, all forwarded
applications/nominations within ten (10) working days after
their receipt.

Each recommended application/nomination with which the
administrator concurs shall be implemented as recommended.

Each recommended application/nomination with which the
administrator does not concur shall be forwarded to the
President with the Committee's and administrator's
recommendations.

E. **Role of the University Committee and the President.** This
section applies only in instances where the Dean or other
appropriate administrator and the respective MPPP Committee
fail to agree.

The President shall transmit both sets of recommendations for
review by a University-wide faculty committee that will ~~be~~
~~comprised of~~ three (3) members chosen by the Executive
Committee of the Academic Senate and two (2) by the President;
within ten (10) working days it shall forward its
recommendation, based upon its consideration of the criteria in
III. above, to the President for his/her consideration in
making a final determination. If the President disagrees with
the university-wide committee, within ten (10) working days
he/she shall state his/her reasons therefor and shall return
the denied application to the originating faculty committee
with the request to forward immediately the alternate
recommendation to the Dean or appropriate administrator as
provided in Article 31.16 of the Memorandum of Understanding
for Unit Three.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

All positive recommendations for Meritorious Performance Incentive
and Professional Promise Incentive Awards shall be forwarded to the

Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs for implementation. <u>A final</u>
<u>list of recipients with category of award shall be distributed to</u>
<u>the campus community.</u>

VII. PROHIBITIONS

A. No MPPP award may be made to any faculty without a positive
recommendation from the appropriate MPPP Committee (See Article
31.19).

B. The collective and separate judgment of the faculty and the
President shall not be grievable except on procedural grounds
(See Article 31.19).

VIII. SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

Each recipient of an MPPP Award for professional promise must
submit a report to the Dean or appropriate administrator describing
how he/she fulfilled the aims laid out in his/her MPPP Award
proposal. These reports must be submitted within one calendar year
of the receipt of the award. In the case of awards for meritorious
performance, the application may be considered the report.

~~IX.---POLICY-REVIEW~~

agreed

~~The-Faculty-Affairs-Committee-of-the-Academic-Senate-shall-review-this~~
~~policy-in-the-Fall-of-1985-and-recommend-to-the-Academic-Senate-any~~
~~appropriate-revisions-as-well-as-a-timetable-for-the-1985-86-MPPP~~   88-89
~~Awards-program,~~ *and subsequent cycles.*

~~NOTE:---For-the-implementation-of-this-policy-for-the-1984-85-academic~~
~~year,-special-dates-are-being-established.---In-future-years-the~~
~~guidelines-in-Section-V.-A.-(SELECTION-PROCESS,-Initiation)-will-be~~
~~followed.~~

\193
Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on December 15, 1987.
Approved by the Executive Committee on January 12, 1988.

*The review shall include consideration
of the role of departmental faculty
in the process.*

Section A:

Name:_____ Department:_____ Current
Academic Year _____

Date of Initial Faculty Appointment (including part-time
appointments):_____ (Month/Year)

Section B:

Have you previously received a Meritorious Performance Incentive Award or a
Professional Promise Incentive Award?
_____Yes (attach copy of previous application statement)
  Date of Award:_____
  Award Category:_____
  Activity/Accomplishment for which award was granted:
  _____
_____No

Section C:

Award Category Currently Applying Under (check one only):
_____Meritorious Performance Incentive Award (Superior Teaching)
_____Meritorious Performance Incentive Award (Significant Professional
  Accomplishments)
_____Meritorious Performance Incentive Award (Outstanding Service to the
  University Community)
_____Professional Promise Incentive Award

Indicate specific activities or accomplishments to be considered:

Period of time covered by this application:_____

Section D:

In order to provide a comprehensive overview of your workload, please provide
the following information:

Do any of the activities/accomplishments that serve as a basis for this
application result in income in addition to your regular salary?
_____Yes _____No (If so, briefly describe.)

For the period of time covered by this application, to a maximum of four
years, show by semesters the classes you taught and their total WIU's; amount
of assigned time for that semester, if any; whether you were full-time or part-
time; and, if part-time, number of units for which you were employed. If you
were on leave (with or without pay) during any of these semesters, indicate the
nature and purpose of the leave.

Year/ Semester	Classes Taught (indicate course #) and # of WIU's	Assigned Time in WIU's (if any)	Full-Time	Part-time (indicate # of units employed)
1) Year_____ Fall Spring				
2) Year_____ Fall Spring				
3) Year_____ Fall Spring				
4) Year_____ Fall Spring				

The guidelines for application must be followed or the application will be
eliminated from consideration.

California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January   , 1988

TO: Bernard Goldstein, Assessment Specialist
           Academic Senate, CSU

FROM: Juanita Barrena, Chair
           Academic Senate
           CSU, Sacramento

SUBJECT: AB 2016

In response to your November 2, 1987, memorandum on the subject
of "Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in
California Higher Education (AB 2016)," CSUS faculty members were
polled to obtain their input on issues involved in AB 2016.
Although only about 10% of the questionnaires were returned, most
questions had majority responses that seemed large enough to be
significant. In addition, a special meeting of the CSUS Academic
Senate was held on January 21, 1988, to discuss the results of
the questionnaire and formulate the campus' response.

The results of the survey and position of the CSUS Academic
Senate are presented in the form of responses to the two
questions in your memo.

1. "How is quality measured?" (See questions 1 and 4.)

    A large majority of respondents (80% +) indicated that
    pre/post testing would be useful for evaluating student
    learning and/or program quality in the areas of basic
    subjects and in individual majors. A smaller majority (65%)
    indicated that testing general education would be useful.
    Additionally, about 2/3 of the faculty thought that a survey
    of alumni satisfaction with CSUS, a tabulation of alumni
    placement, and a survey of employer satisfaction would also
    be useful. A larger fraction, about 3/4, were supportive of
    a survey that would determine how many of our graduates were
    admitted to, or completed, post-baccalaureate programs.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

We also asked to what degree the knowledge of minority student enrollment and retention statistics would help us evaluate program quality. About 2/3 of the faculty indicated that these data would be pertinent and useful.

A study of general education effectiveness carried out at Trenton State University in New Jersey began with a determination of the goals of its general education program. We asked our faculty if a determination of goals would be useful, and 73% responded affirmatively. Two other factors that were mentioned in AB 2016 were strongly supported: evaluation of student support services such as advising and counseling (83%) and availability and utilization of teaching programs for faculty (87%).

While survey results appear positive, we would like to issue a caveat; even a majority of 60-70% implies that a significant (and probably vocal) minority is opposed to the issue. In fact, such a minority exists on several questions: the ability to test general education (35%), the usefulness or possibility of measuring of alumni satisfaction with their experience at CSUS (35%), and the usefulness of compiling the minority student enrollment (36%) and retention (33%) data. As you are aware, opposition by a substantial percentage of faculty makes program implementation very difficult.

2. "How can the state budget be utilized?"   (Questions 2, 3, and 5)

A majority (68%) of faculty responding to the questionnaire indicated that our present budget would have to be supplemented not only to provide incentive funding, but also to fund the development and administration of additional assessment studies as stated in the bill. Only 10% of respondents would support additional outcome assessment if it were funded out of existing resources. Only 70% thought the funds should be awarded for the development of plans, while 86% supported funding the implementation of improvement plans. About 3/4 of the respondents thought that both improvement of programs and excellence of programs should be supported.

Finally, an interesting contradiction was evident; even though AB 2016 proposes a "cooperative" model, with funding provided for the whole higher education system, 73% of faculty respondents indicated that individual institutions, rather than entire systems, should be rewarded for program improvement.

We would also like to comment on some other aspects of the
bill in terms of what is currently being done in the area of
assessment. A considerable effort is being put forth on our
campus on program reviews. In fact, we will evaluate the
review process this year with an eye on simplifying the
process. Also, to a certain extent, pre- and post-testing is
occurring. For example, the English Placement Examination
and Entry Level Mathematics examination are administered to
entering students, and the Writing Proficiency Examination is
required for graduation.

Even though the faculty response was supportive of the
concept of using testing and surveys to assess program
quality, we would like to mention a few of the reservations
expressed by our faculty. The first is the immense cost of
such a program, both in terms of the logistical costs of
administering and evaluating a series of tests and surveys
and in the thousands of hours that would be involved in
preparing acceptable examinations if, indeed that would be
possible. Another concern is that funding needs might result
in questionable practices (e.g., teaching to the test, rather
than to the strength of the faculty, or shifting the emphasis
within the University merely to maximize the possible
rewards), in short, to let funding, rather than good
pedagogy, lead to program change.

In summary, while the CSUS Academic Senate recognizes the
value of various forms of testing, surveys, and other we also recognize
measures in assessing and improving program quality, and the
potential for abuse, particularly when results are tied to
incentive funding, of even greater concern is the high cost
of implementing additional assessment programs and the lack
of assurance in AB 2016 that supplemental funding will be provided
funded for assessment.

JB/CD
Attachment: Survey Results

Summary of Questionnaire on Incentive Funding Approaches
December 1987

I. TABULATION

The letter you believe best applies to each item below, based on the following:

a. Useful--worth the effort to get the information.
b. Too difficult to measure--don't even try.
c. Useful--our department collects this information now.
d. Not very useful.
e. Not at all useful.

1a. Which of the following kinds of information would be useful for evaluating student learning and/or program quality?

	a	b	c	d	e
Pre/post student evaluation of increased knowledge in:					
Basic Skills	69	3	5	6	3
General Education	52	18	1	7	5
Major Field	64	7	6	4	5
Specific program goals for the G.E. program	53	7	3	9	5
Faculty satisfaction with how well G.E. program goals are met	45	10	2	22	9
Alumni satisfaction with CSUS	48	7	11	18	7
Alumni placement	46	5	14	15	9
Employer satisfaction with CSUS graduates	49	11	6	1	9
% of graduates entering post-baccalaureate programs	56	2	12	14	5
% of graduates completing post-baccalaureate programs	56	5	7	15	3
% of programs eligible for accreditation that are accredited	61	4	4	15	4
% enrollment of minority students	51	2	2	17	13
% retention of minority students	56	0	4	17	12

Summary of Questionnaire on Incentive Funding Approaches

1b. [See Section II, Comments.]
1c. [See Section II, Comments.]

	Yes	No	Maybe
2. Would you support additional outcome studies if they received supplementary funding?	62	9	20
3. Would you support additional outcome studies if they were funded out of existing resources?	9	54	27

4. AB 2016 lists many factors that should be included in an evaluation of university quality. Do you believe that the following should be included?

	Yes	No	Maybe
A. Availability of high calibre student support services, including academic and personal counseling?	68	14	8
B. Availability and utilization of teaching improvement programs for faculty?	68	10	14

5. AB 2016's sponsors express the intention of "rewarding institutions for improvement of student learning." What is your opinion of the following approaches:

	Yes	No	Maybe
A. Reward the entire system (CC, CSU, UC) for improvement in one or more aspects of its program?	19	57	13
B. Reward improvement institution by institution?	55	20	15
C. Provide funds for programs in need of improvement to develop an improvement plan?	49	21	21

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

D.	Provide funds for programs in need of improvement to implement an improvement plan?	65	11	14
E.	Reward programs that demonstrate improvement?	57	17	16
F.	Reward programs that demonstrate excellence?	61	21	7

II. COMMENTS

1a. Which of the following kinds of information would be useful
for evaluating student learning and/or program quality?

Pre/post student evaluation of increased knowledge in Basic
Skills:

Be sure courses are all taken here and not at other universities.

Too large a selection of G.E. content to measure.

Program is too diverse.

Is this thought to be "improvement" as referred to in question 5?

The area is covered by course completion standards or current
exams.

These are so diverse and taught by so many faculty and
departments, I don't know how you can measure, control measures
or do anything with the results.

How much increased? (and how increased?).

Especially to evaluate for remedial help.

Semestral.

The problem is that the goal of the program becomes performance
on the evaluation, which is not the proper goal of the program.
Do we want statewide major programs?

There are the EPT and ELM tests, then the WPE and passing of math
requirement--what else do you need?

Pre/post student evaluation of increase knowledge in General
Education:

These are so diverse and taught by so many faculty and

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

departments, I don't know how you can measure, control measures
or do anything with the results.

How much increased? (and how increased?).

The problem is that the goal of the program becomes performance
on the evaluation, which is not the proper goal of the program.
Do we want statewide major programs?

Pre/post student evaluation of increased knowledge in Major
Field:

We do post (in comps), but not specific pre-test.

The area is covered by course completion standards or current
exams.

These are so diverse and taught by so many faculty and
departments, I don't know how you can measure, control measures
or do anything with the results.

How much increased? (and how increased?).

The problem is that the goal of the program becomes performance
on the evaluation, which is not the proper goal of the program.
Do we want statewide major programs?

Specific program goals for the G.E. Program:

It might be useful to students to know what are the G.E. program
goals and objectives.

O.K. program quality.

Don't understand the question.

"Specific"..."G.E."--contradiction in terms.

A political mess with no coherence.

As pertaining to the major.

The area is covered by course completion standards or current
exams.

I don't understand. Do we have goals now or not? Do you mean
formulate some? evaluate what we now have? change them?

Maybe after you get results in above question.

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

To the degree that the goals are substantive rather than numerical. Numbers can be a cop out rather than content.

Faculty satisfaction with how well G.E. program goals are met:

?Only certain faculty would know (in specific areas).

Subjective and irrelevant to higher education.

Too vague and too broad. What do most know of the majority of G.E. courses?

Alumni satisfaction with CSUS:

There is a "value-added" component to this, so the institution with better students coming in will win this contest.

Alumni placement:

Longitudinal study, 5-year post-grad.

There is a "value-added" component to this, so the institution with better students coming in will win this contest.

Unknown.

Employer satisfaction with CSUS graduates:

We do this informally at the present time.

Too compounded by extraneous variables to be meaningful.

This is not a trade school.

Longitudinal study, 5-year post-grad.

There is a "value-added" component to this, so the institution with better students coming in will win this contest.

Excellent.

% of graduates entering post-baccalaureate programs:

Not high priority for judging the effectiveness of an institution.

Don't know--it is a requirement in our field, but I question need for others.

By major.

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

Let's not get into a numbers game.

Unknown, probably less than 20%.

% of graduates completing post-baccalaureate programs:

Not high priority for judging the effectiveness of an institution.

By major.

Unknown, probably less than 10%.

% of programs eligible for accreditation that are accredited:

In some fields it is more prestigious to not be accredited!

Unknown.

% enrollment of minority students.

Useful from a public policy perspective but not from student learning and program quality perspectives.

Not a "quality" measure, but valuable information for Education Equity.

The data is important, but not to assess quality of programs. If minorities are not attracted or retained to a program, the problem should be studied separately.

We have worried about this before. It becomes a numbers game and we tend to be lenient in grading and graduating these people. This neither serves well the minority population nor society.

Depends on % in region.

Approximately 10%.

% retention of minority students.

Useful from a public policy perspective but not from student learning and program quality perspectives.

Too many spurious factors other than education at CSUS (e.g., poor preparation before entering).

Not a "quality" measure, but valuable information for Education Equity.

Major concern that we can directly influence.

We have worried about this before. It becomes a numbers game and we tend to be lenient in grading and graduating these people. This neither serves well the minority population nor society.

Institutions with more financial aid available (e.g., U.C.) will win here. Also, if % of retention becomes the goal, instead of % of students retained and educated, then meaningless degrees to minority students around and give them meaningless degrees to keep the % high. But this is a disservice to the minority students who, if challenged, might perform and benefit from a college education.

Graduation of minority students--useful; worth the effort to get the information.

Approximately 15%.

1b. Other areas that could and should be evaluated:

It is perhaps telling that this questionnaire seeks nothing about academic standards (except directly in 1a above), or promoting the maintenance of high academic standards. Attention to academic standards is an absolute necessity if your report is to be responsive to the legislative mandate.

Number of students who use student services (Learning Skills, Counseling).

Programs that encourage or discourage students to achieve.

Require doctorates for all faculty hired tenure track.

At what points (specific classes/instructors) do minority/women students drop out?

Area (geographic) served by CSUS.

Competency in English--spoken and written.

Student results on professional exams--CPA, CMA, etc. (if available).

M.A. graduates entering and completing Ph.D. programs. Graduates securing fellowship and assistantship opportunities for graduates programs. Graduates entering professional schools by discipline (e.g., law, medicine, veterinary and from what major departments).

Improvement of faculty evaluation by students.

Overall retention rate; % of budget allocated to pursue excellence in quality.

Information literacy skills, library research skills.

Employee affirmative action and equal employment opportunity. What is the use of increasing the number of minority students, if they are to be changed by an alien cultural environment?

The actual G.E. courses taken by individual students should be evaluated to find out if students are putting together programs which add up to a meaningful total experience (Probably impossible to do!). Students evaluation of their program and their own progress--This should be done once a year and preferably not at a high stress time--February would be good.

Student evaluations of faculty, qualifications of faculty, research and public levels, teaching load, faculty salaries and benefits, faculty development opportunities.

Tom Hayden's competency.

Whether "student evaluation" should be returned to its original function or discontinued for sheer waste of time and money. administrative use of the results is unlawful in any case.

Following students enrolled in post-graduate work to see % that successfully are employed in their field. Looking at ongoing research programs at the university and the number of items that successfully involve students.

% of failures by individual professors. How well did they teach?

None--metrics/mathematics requires an empirical teaching in/of the university.

Learning skills or tutorial programs for undergraduate students. High school GPA of entering students. Community college GPA of transfer students.

Emphasize learning of skills to acquire knowledge as well as learning content.

1c. Comments:

The current "free-market" G.E. program allows, even encourages, students to select the easy route. With the exception of the one

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

three-unit "advanced study" course, with a minimum writing requirement, our G.E. program is absent any attention to academic standards. Consequently, in pursuit of FTE, some departments offer the snap course for G.E. credit where attendance is the primary basis for evaluating student performance. Such is the extreme, but the extreme defines the limits of what is allowed for G.E. credit. Departments offering G.E. program courses should be expected to observe some standards in evaluating student performance. The standards should be developed by the various G.E. program subcommittees and the G.E. Committee.

Externally devised and administered tests, before and after, of basic skills, G.E. values, and some major field material would be cheap, valuable in assessing value added, and are long overdue.

Do whatever possible to make sure a program does not see the light of day. It will be an awful mess.

Student Affairs involvement with recruitment, retention needs to be evaluated, included.

This program should emphasize "how to" improve quality and define "measurable" criteria for evaluation.

The use of student evaluations for this purpose may not be very productive unless we establish very concrete criteria for excellence in teaching.

Among ARTP, accreditation and curriculum review, we already spend so much time evaluating our teaching we don't have time to properly teach.

A number of meaningless "buzz words" are used in the Bill. "Talent"--what's that? "Performance criterion"--according to the Commission? "Success"--what kind? "Measures of quality"--such as? "Improvement"--on tests? "Value" of General Education has nothing to do with examination grades, necessarily. Assessment of teaching quality--what is quality? Student evaluation gives no help.

While there might be extra money for such as this for a year or two, soon it would not be "extra." A smaller and smaller % of education funding goes into the classroom--we get more and more employees of the university who don't ever enter a classroom, and the classroom pays for it! It appears that CPEC will give this a positive recommendation no matter what we do. Perhaps our best response is to get CPEC to attach a realistic price tag to this, to scare the Legislature and the Governor into a rational decision.

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

Don't get carried away with numerical evaluations or emphasis on other aspects of quality assessment that divert attention from increasing the number, retention and graduation of minority students. Adding more tests to G.E. does not increase the quality of teaching. For a state institution, a prominent measurement of its success is the number of "persons of the state," all the people that the "state" represents are educated. To have comprehensive exams that measure a superficial content of specific subject matter rather than include course requirements for a 21st century multi-cultural society does little to add to quality of education.

Close down the Administration Building. Spare us your questionnaires. The university requires the _____ of time--not this nonsense.

The mentoring program should be strengthened and expanded to reach evening students along with the traditional students.

2. Would you support additional outcome studies if they received supplementary funding?

No funding is supplementary. It reduces funding elsewhere. The state gives only so much!

Certainly.

Among ARTP, accreditation and curriculum review, we already spend so much time evaluating our teaching we don't have time to properly teach.

Studies become an end in themselves. What is needed is to funnel funds where they will directly benefit students.

I would want to see what is measured.

"If pigs could fly..."

3. Would you support additional outcome studies if they were funded out of existing resources?

Yes, but I'm not aware of resource surplus, and I wonder where will the resources come from?

Cut the executive vice president position. Have any of the past occupants done anything beyond ceremonies?

No--the instructional budget is suffering enough.

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

Depends if the additional information is worth the additional
costs.

4. AB 2016 lists many factors that should be included in an
evaluation of university quality. Do you believe that the
following should be included?

A. Availability of higher caliber student support services,
including academic and personal counseling?

Plus remediation programs for "high risk" "high gain" students
who have been admitted and who should not be left to "sink or
swim."

Services may support the retention of students, but what has that
to do with quality?

The quality of these programs have been sacrificed for
administrative expansion at certain points in our history and I
think we have seen dire consequences result in terms of reduction
of the well being of students.

B. Availability and utilization of teaching improvement programs
for faculty?

If provided by released time to faculty.

We all, always, need improving.

The quality of these programs have been sacrificed for
administrative expansion at certain points in our history and I
think we have seen dire consequences result in terms of reduction
of the well being of students.

When the "improvement" is clearly given meaning.

University faculty are (or should be) scholars. Too much
emphasis on teaching skills would detract from main purpose of
university which is research. However, some help in
communications and presentations could be useful.

This would make such programs an industry, regardless of effect
upon teaching. Programs should exist because of a need, not
because a funding formula rewards us for their existence. Let's
not have such a funding formula, O.K.?

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

5. AB 2016's sponsors express the intention of "rewarding
institutions for improvement of student learning." What is your
opinion of the following approaches:

First there must be some agreement upon the dimensions of
improvement. What improvements and how measured.

5.A. Reward the entire system (CC, CSU, UC) for improvement in
one or more aspects of its programs?

There ought to be continual improvement without reward.
Measurement probably impossible, guidelines impractical.

Yes, if there we can agree upon aspects common to the entire
system.

I don't know what "improvement" is!

Money will be lost in administration.

Based on how the testing is conducted.

Institutions need continuing support for their efforts to improve
programs and to be encouraged to improve where it is needed.

We should do this anyway. Publicity is more than enough.

Unworkable; political; meaningless; divisive; U.C. and C.C. are
funded differently, so we are bound to lose. Does anyone
seriously believe that the CSU can enter such a competition and
not lose from the outset (as U.C. will have its way in the
measurement system)?

Reward will be meaningless because of Gann cap, etc. History
suggests it will be "peanuts."

Why not reward those that are doing a good job. If you are a
disaster, you could show improvement, collect your reward and
then go back to your old ways.

Depends on the nature of the rewards as they impact on the
educational environment.

5.B. Reward improvement institution by institution?

There ought to be continual improvement without reward.
Measurement probably impossible, guidelines impractical.

This will cause all hell to break loose.

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

Depends. Yes, if only one institution achieved in the one aspect shared by the entire system (5.A above).

If proper measures can be developed.

Link rewards more concretely, i.e., the school, division, department, or program that displays improvements.

I don't know what "improvement" is!

Rewards then are closer to those whose efforts have earned the reward.

This whole concept is full of problems. How is improvement measured?

When the meaning of "improvement" is clearly stated.

Use publicity. Would generate non-productive paper work and arguments.

Divisive; political; meaningless.

Is the goal to create competition between institutions or benefit the student body. We don't want competition, but a healthy cooperation in education.

If its "add on" money.

5.C. Provide funds for programs in need of improvement to develop an improvement plan?

The sequence here is important--obviously you don't want to reward a failed program by giving it more money. But if no program has yet been tried or could be tried--then development and implementation funds make sense.

This should be primary.

How do you know what ones these are?

Encouraging--and assisting--people to think of improving their areas may be very useful in and of itself.

You can improve student evaluations of faculty by giving higher grades. You can create grade inflation by trying to show that your program has improved.

When the meaning of "improvement" is clearly stated.

Summary of Questionnaire on
Incentive Funding Approaches

Some support for development is necessary--faculty are already overburdened.

Just mandate it.

Depends on why program is in need of improvement and how previous funding has been used.

$ for improvement are needed, but we won't get any extra $ out of this sort of thing.

That's their responsibility.

Have to have planning $.

D. Provide funds for programs in need of improvement to implement an improvement plan?

This should be second.

This is their department responsibility.

What is a "program?" A major? or what?

Funds are always wasted when the result is hard to quantify.

When the meaning of "improvement" is clearly stated.

Once a plan is in place, then funds for implementation are crucial.

$ for improvement are needed, but we won't get any extra $ out of this sort of thing.

Less crucial than planning.

5.E. Reward programs that demonstrate improvement?

If they do it cost effectively.

This should be third.

Adequate response to this question depends on the operational meanings of "improvement" and "excellence."

This is easier to measure than some notion of "excellence."

Why "reward" for satisfying a professional "obligation?" (Programs cannot be rewarded, only the people who present them.)

Funds to maintain and improve successful programs should have top priority--especially if such successful program's techniques are shared.

Publicity only.

How much improvement is rewarded?

Improvement and excellence may require $. Implicit in such approaches is the notion that programs aren't doing well because they have no incentive to do well. Hogwash! They typically don't do well because they are not properly supported. So the adequately supported programs get more $, and the under-supported programs lose $ (to come up with the "extra" $ to support the adequately supported programs).

How and by whom are "improvement" and "excellence" going to be evaluated?

5.F. Reward programs that demonstrate excellence?

Difficult to measure. Judgmental.

If they do it cost effectively.

Yes, but only after the minimum standards and achievement have been defined and attended to.

Adequate response to this question depends on the operational meanings of "improvement" and "excellence."

If you could operationally define.

This is easier to measure than some notion of "excellence."

Why "reward" for satisfying a professional "obligation?" (Programs cannot be rewarded, only the people who present them.)

Funds to maintain and improve successful programs should have top priority--especially if such successful program's techniques are shared.

Publicity only.

We are about the business of doing our very best. How can we barter or negotiate what we are already obligated to do in our institutions.

How and by whom are "improvement" and "excellence" going to be evaluated?

Improvement and excellence may require $. Implicit in such approaches is the notion that programs aren't doing well because they have no incentive to do well. Hogwash! They typically don't do well because they are not properly supported. So the adequately supported programs get more $, and the under-supported programs lose $ (to come up with the "extra" $ to support the adequately supported programs).

Additional Comments:

It's hard to develop a position on this without really understanding the ramifications. Seems to focus exclusively on undergraduate education.

Please do everything possible to resist this sort of pernicious enterprise. No doubt, a little assessment in some areas is a good thing. But it must be done carefully, and a statewide program won't be careful. A lot of assessment is a bad thing. And incentive funding is the single worst idea I've heard for education in my career as an educator.

Pretty much all kind--a loaded--no?

I think the G.E. program should be an ELITE program of 20 to 30 units taught by the "BEST" professors who have reduced teaching loads and receive extra pay. If departments wish to add additional units, they are free to do so.

Let's try to be academic for awhile. Yes, I know it's not likely. This junk is easier.